

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/455,821

Applicant(s)
Armstrong

Examiner
Karl Easthom

Group Art Unit
2832



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Karl Easthom

(3) _____

(2) Brad Armstrong

(4) _____

Date of Interview Sep 19, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: all

Identification of prior art discussed:
Furukawa (JP 5-87760), Mitchell (3806471), and art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

It was agreed to amend claim 30 such that the word "snap" was inserted before "threshold" on line 6 to overcome the prior art of record. The Examiner asserted that the feedback 124 and 120 on the analog sensor of Fig. 23 of Mitchell could be viewed as a "threshold" tactile feedback when for example, one's finger pushed the button 124 to align with the cap 120, and the finger then sensed the alignment. It was agreed that this feedback is not a "snap" type as defined in the specification. Similar remarks apply to the feedback of the button 2,3 in Furukawa. It was agreed that "snap" type feed back is known for digital type encoding or sensing (on-off sensing), see Kambic (IBMTD) element 8, but there is no suggestion to employ the snap type feed back with an analog or variable output sensor wherein the amount of force applied varies the sensed output.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.